UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,019	10/23/2003	Brijesh Krishnaswami	306622.01	2371

47973 7590 10/09/2009

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CTY, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
WANG, RONGFA PHILIP	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/693,019	KRISHNASWAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PHILIP WANG	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 August 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *40-75* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *40-75* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *40,64,67,69,70 and 73-75* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to RCE filed on 8/13/2009.

2. Per Applicant's request, claims 40, 64, 67, 69, 70, and 73 have been amended.

3. Claims 40-75 are pending.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In view of the newly amended claims which includes the limitation of "a process architecture for the instance of the application". Specification, page 17, last sentence, does mention process architecture. However, the examiner believes "process architecture" in the specification and claims should be "processor architecture". A processor architecture for the instance of application means the type of processor that is can be used to execute the instance of application. However, a process architecture for the instance of the application does not appear to have a well-understood meanings. The Applicant is required to clarify this or further amend the specification and claims. Claims 40, 64, 67, 69-70, and 73-75 are objected for similar reasons.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 67-68and 70 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

A claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. However, not all processes are statutory under 35 U.S.C. § 101. To be statutory, a claimed process must either: (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transform a particular article into a different state or thing. *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943, 954 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (en banc).

If the limitations tying the process to a computer are not actually limiting, *i.e.*, they do not reduce the preemptive footprint of the claim, then the process is not sufficiently tied to a particular machine or apparatus to be statutory. *Id.* at 955 (citing *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 71-72 (1972)). Mere field-of-use limitations are generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible process claim patent-eligible. *Id.* at 957 (citing *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 191-192 (1981)). Nor will insignificant extrasolution activity render such a process statutory. *Id.* (citing *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 191-92; *In re Schrader*, 22 F.3d 290, 294 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

Regarding transformation of data, the en banc panel in *Bilski* noted that an algorithm (an unpatentable fundamental principle) merely combined with a data-gathering step was non-statutory because, "A requirement simply that data inputs be gathered—without specifying how—is a meaningless limit on a claim to an algorithm because every algorithm inherently requires the gathering of data inputs," and, "Further, the inherent step of gathering data can also fairly be characterized as insignificant extra-solution activity." *Id.* at 963 (citing *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 590 (1978)). Further, transformations of abstractions do not meet the test for transformation of an article to a different state or thing because, "[Such abstractions] are not physical objects or substances, and they are not representative of physical objects or substances." *Id.* at 963-64.

For a claimed process to be patent-eligible, the use of a specific machine or transformation of an article must impose meaningful limits on the claim's scope, and the involvement of the machine or transformation in the claimed process must not merely be insignificant extra-solution activity. *Id.* at 961-62.

The above claims are directed to a "method for facilitating configuration management." However, the steps involved in the method appear to relate to abstract organization of data that are not tied to a particular machine or apparatus, nor transform a particular article into a different state or thing. The storing step, though including a standardized configuration store, such standardized configuration store can be just paper and pencil for recording information and can be manually performed. Therefore, the claim does not appear to be a proper statutory process under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 40-57, 59-62, 67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (herein Keller, USPGN 2004/0049509), Ahlstrom et al. (herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468), in view of Grier et al. (herein Grier, USPGN 2002/0100017) and further in view of Chang et al. (herein Chang, USPGN, 2005/0015761).

As per claim 40,

Keller discloses

- A memory component;
- a configuration store that stores persisted information associated with setting for each of a plurality of instances of an application onto the memory component according to a uniform semantics scheme, the storage of persisted information for each of the plurality of instances isolated from persisted information for any of the remaining plurality of instances; , the persisted information comprising of configuration information and dependency information ([0055], "…exposes the management characteristics and capabilities of a (managed) resource through well-defined (sometimes even standardized)…"; Fig. 2A, [0097], [0098] where discloses a system that containing configuration store 225 comprising dependency information. [0117], where a configuration files of a managed resource is disclose (last line in this paragraph), [0118], where an example Window Registry is disclose as a location of configuration files; [0134], "…This information is described in flat XML files" where XML is considered having uniform semantics.; [0129], "…distinguish he various application instances…", where it discloses distinguishable application instances and therefore, isolation of the plurality of application instances; [0097], " Examples of managed resources include...hardware components...and software components…", where managed resources can be software.); and,

- a configuration service component that manages access to the configuration store, (Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230.).

Keller does not specifically disclose

- The configuration store is a standardized configuration store; and converts information associated with an application into the persisted information associated with each of the plurality of instances of the application.

However, Ahlstrom discloses

- The configuration store is a unified configuration store (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…"); and
- converts information associated with an application into unified persisted information (C12:9-15, claim 4, "…identifying a configuration…converting the configuration information into a standard format…" One interpretation of a unified configuration data is configuration data with standard format.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahlstrom into the teachings of Keller to

include the limitation disclosed by Ahlstrom. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to deal with idiosyncratic systems with standardized representations as suggested by Ahlstrom (c6: 57-58).

Keller/ Ahlstrom does not specifically disclose

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application.

However, Grier discloses

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application ([0043], TABLE 1, for name, version, processor architecture, public key token and language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Grier into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom to include the limitation disclosed by Grier. The modification would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to want to unambiguously identify information as suggested by Grier ([0041])

Keller/ Ahlstrom/Grier does not specifically disclose

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID.

However, Chang discloses

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID([0114], "...the namespace...of... application...such as...deployment ID...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Chang into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom/Grier to include the limitation disclosed by Chang. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide differentiation of various versions in terms of certain elements or features of applications in namespace by adding deployment ID as suggested by Chang ([0062])

As per claim 41, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the information associated with an application is at least one of configuration information or dependency information([0097], [0098] where discloses a system that containing configuration store 225 comprising dependency information.).

As per claim 42, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the configuration service component receives a manifest associated with the application, the manifest comprising at least one of configuration and dependency information associated with the application(Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230."; [0117], where a configuration files of a managed resource is disclose (last line in this paragraph), [0118], where an example Window Registry is disclose as a location of configuration files);

Ahlstrom discloses

and the configuration service component converts and stores at least some of the manifest information in the unified configuration store(c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…";C12:9-15, claim 4, "…identifying a configuration…converting the configuration information into a standard format…" One interpretation of a unified configuration data is configuration data with standard format.).

As per claim 43, the rejection of claim 42 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the manifest is based, at least in part, upon a schema ([0153], "…XML Schema…").

As per claim 44, the rejection of claim 43 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the schema is XML-based ([0153], "…XML Schema…").

As per claim 45, the rejection of claim 42 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the manifest employing at least one of strong typing, validation, and assertions ([0145], "…applying filter rules…" where applying rules is validation).

As per claim 46, the rejection of claim 42 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

wherein the configuration service component compiles at least one of manifest information into a namespace, the configuration service component providing access to the namespace ([0128], "…navigate...the model.... a globally unique name for identifying the component..." where navigation provides access to the information.).

As per claim 47, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller/ Ahlstrom disclose

further comprising a configuration management engine that identifies configuration information within the persisted information and facilitates management of at least a

portion of the configuration information (Keller discloses facilitates management and identification of configuration information, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230, for at least the reason that queries requires identification of information; Ahlstrom discloses unified persisted information, c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…";).

As per claim 48, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- the configuration service component facilitating access to a legacy store ([0118], "…the Microsoft Windows Registry…" where registry can be accessed.).

As per claim 49, the rejection of claim 48 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the legacy store comprising a registry ([0118], "…the Microsoft Windows Registry…").

As per claim 50, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the configuration service component facilitating at least one management service(Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230.).

As per claim 51, the rejection of claim 50 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the management service comprising at least one of a group policy component and a roaming component(FIG 2A, 250 Policy).

As per claim 52, the rejection of claim 50 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

the management service facilitating at least one of install, usage, servicing, uninstall, roaming, migration, setup, provisioning, policy, backup and/or restore ([0009], "…installation…").

As per claim 53, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

further comprising an assertion engine that facilitates administration of a validation rule by the configuration service component (Fig. 2A, 245 Dependency Service, where dependency is validated.).

As per claim 54, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

further comprising a notification handler that provides information associated with a configuration change of the application to at least one of the application and another application ([0082], "… provides a publish/subscribe interface for notifying for changes…").

As per claim 55, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- further comprising a legacy handler that facilitates synchronization of the system with a legacy store ([0118], "…maintain references…the Microsoft Windows Registry…").

As per claim 56, the rejection of claim 55 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- the legacy store comprising a registry ([0118], "…maintain references…the Microsoft Windows Registry…").

As per claim 57, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the configuration service component facilitates transacted commits for saving related changes together in the configuration store (Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency

repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230.).

As per claim 59, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

- wherein the configuration service component facilitates change logs and history([0082], "…a notion of history in order to detect and determine changes…").

As per claim 60, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller/ Ahlstrom disclose

wherein the configuration store comprises a joint engine technology database that stores a settings namespace (Keller -FIG 2A for database, where database supports joint operation; Ahlstrom- c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…";).

As per claim 61, the rejection of claim 60 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

wherein a namespace comprises metadata on settings comprising types, attributes, and user context, the namespace further comprising instance values of the settings([0153], "…XML Schema…"; [0114], "…user profiles and preferences…"; [0149], "… the descriptions of services and components or the retrieval of values of specific attributes…").

As per claim 62, the rejection of claim 61 is incorporated;

Keller discloses

wherein at least one of the metadata on the settings and instance values of the settings is stored for each user context ([0114], "…user profiles and preferences…").

As per claims 67 and 69

Keller discloses

- receiving a manifest associated with an application, the manifest comprising at least configuration information and dependency information associated with a plurality of instances of the application; (Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230."; [0117], where a configuration files of a managed resource is disclose (last line in this paragraph), [0118], where an example Window Registry is disclose as a location of configuration files; [0129], "…distinguish he various application instances…", where it discloses distinguishable application instances and therefore, isolation of the plurality of application instances;);

- registering the manifest; processing the manifest to generate persisted information associated with settings for each of the plurality of instances of the application from at least one of the configuration information or the dependency information for each of the plurality of instances; and storing at least some of the persisted information in a configuration store according to a uniform semantics scheme, the persisted information for each of the plurality of instances isolated from persisted information for all of the remaining plurality of instances ([0082], "…registered for changes within the dependency model…"; [0129], "…distinguish he various application instances…", where it discloses distinguishable application instances and therefore, isolation of the plurality of application instances; [0134], "…This information is described in flat XML files" where XML is considered having uniform semantics.).

Keller does not specifically disclose

- The persisted information is stanardized and the configuration store is unified.

However, Ahlstrom

- The persisted information is unified and the configuration store is unified (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahlstrom into the teachings of Keller to include the limitation disclosed by Ahlstrom. The modification would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to want to deal with idiosyncratic systems with standardized representations as suggested by Ahlstrom (c6: 57-58).

Keller/ Ahlstrom does not specifically disclose

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application.

However, Grier discloses

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application ([0043], TABLE 1, for name, version, processor architecture, public key token and language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Grier into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom to include the limitation disclosed by Grier. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to unambiguously identify information as suggested by Grier ([0041])

Keller/ Ahlstrom/Grier does not specifically disclose

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID.

However, Chang discloses

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID([0114], "...the namespace...of... application...such as...deployment ID...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Chang into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom/Grier to include the limitation disclosed by Chang. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide differentiation of various versions in terms of certain elements or features of applications in namespace by adding deployment ID as suggested by Chang ([0062])

As per claim 68, the rejection of claim 67 is incorporated;

Keller/Ahlstrom disclose

further comprising compiling at least a portion of the unified persisted information into a namespace (Keller: [0152] for URI, Ahlstrom, c8:56-58 for standard format.).

7. Claims 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (herein Keller, USPGN 2004/0049509), Ahlstrom et al.(herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468),

Pham et al. (herein Pham, USPTN 5,524,253), in view of Grier et al. (herein Grier, USPGN 2002/0100017) and further in view of Chang et al. (herein Chang, USPGN, 2005/0015761).

As per claim 64,

Keller discloses

A configuration management system comprising:

- a local cache that at least temporarily stores changes to persisted information associated with settings for an application; and a configuration management engine that facilitates communication of the changed persisted information to a configuration service component, the configuration management engine facilitating an isolation of the changed persisted information at least until a notification is received that the changed persisted information has been committed. (store (Fig. 2B, shows an Administrator GUI 285 containing memory which is cache stores requests sent to the system; see FIG. 2A; [0129], "…distinguish he various application instances…", where it discloses distinguishable application instances and therefore, isolation of the plurality of application instances; [0082], "… provides a publish/subscribe interface for notifying for changes…", where a change is considered committing information; Fig. 2A, Repository Agent 230, [0098], "The resource dependency repository 225 can be queries, updated and modified through a repository agent 230.).

Keller does not specifically disclose

- The persisted information is unified.

However, Ahlstrom discloses

- The persisted information is unified (c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…" One interpretation of unified persisted information is standard representation of the information.);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahlstrom into the teachings of Keller to include the limitation discloses by Ahlstrom. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to deal with idiosyncratic systems with standardized representations as suggested by Ahlstrom (c6: 57-58).

Keller/ Ahlstrom do not specifically disclose

- The changed unified persisted information stored in the local cache.

However, Pham discloses

- The changed unified persisted information stored in the local cache (c7:14-20, "…source machine's format is converted to destination machine's formation…using locally stored routines…on the source machine…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Pham into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom to include the limitation disclosed by Pham. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to allow applications having different physical data characteristic to communicate as suggested by Pham (see abstract).

Keller/ Ahlstrom/ Pham does not specifically disclose

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application.

However, Grier discloses

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application ([0043], TABLE 1, for name, version, processor architecture, public key token and language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Grier into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom/ Pham to include the limitation disclosed by Grier. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to unambiguously identify information as suggested by Grier ([0041])

Keller/ Ahlstrom/ Pham /Grier does not specifically disclose

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID.

However, Chang discloses

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID([0114], "...the namespace...of... application...such as...deployment ID...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Chang into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom/ Pham /Grier to include the limitation disclosed by Chang. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide differentiation of various versions in terms of certain elements or features of applications in namespace by adding deployment ID as suggested by Chang ([0062]).

As per claim 65, the rejection of claim 64 is incorporated;

Ahlstrom

the unified persisted information comprising at least a standardized representation of configuration information (c8: 56-58, "...standard representation of configuration information is stored...".)

As per claim 66, the rejection of claim 65 is incorporated;

Ahlstrom

the configuration information comprises at least information other than dependency information (c8: 56-58, "...standard representation of configuration information is stored..."; c6:55-60).

8. Claims 70-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giel et al. (herein Giel, USPGN 2002/0169738), Kaltenmark et al. (herein Kaltenmark, USPTN 7,415,509), in view of Grier et al. (herein Grier, USPGN 2002/0100017) and further in view of Chang et al. (herein Chang, USPGN, 2005/0015761).

As per claims 70, 73,

Giel discloses

providing a manifest, the manifest associated with configuration information of a first application (claim 18, shows collector collecting configuration information);

processing the manifest to generate persistent information associated with settings for the first application; storing the persistent information according to a uniform semantics scheme so as to isolate information associated with each of a plurality of instances of the first application; ([0259], "...parameter settings for a list of hosts..."; claim 19, "...converting configuration information into uniform format"; [0080], "…for each node, there is a configuration information file stored on the tracker database…", therefore the isolation, and a database is considered having a uniform semantics scheme.); and

accessing a configuration setting of the first application within the persistent information (claim 18, "…analyzing the configuration information…").

Giel does not specifically disclose

- dependency information

However, Kaltenmark discloses

- dependency information (c10: 54-55, "…dependency information is maintained by the configuration…").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Kaltenmark into the teachings of Giel to include the limitation disclosed by Kaltenmark. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to perform impact analysis by providing dependency information as suggested by Kaltenmark (C10:50-54).

Giel / Kaltenmark does not specifically disclose

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application.

However, Grier discloses

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the

application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application ([0043], TABLE 1, for name, version, processor architecture, public key token and language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Grier into the teachings of Giel / Kaltenmark to include the limitation disclosed by Grier. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to unambiguously identify information as suggested by Grier ([0041])

Giel / Kaltenmark /Grier does not specifically disclose

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID.

However, Chang discloses

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID([0114], "...the namespace...of... application...such as...deployment ID...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Chang into the teachings of Giel / Kaltenmark /Grier to include the limitation disclosed by Chang. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide differentiation of various versions in terms of certain elements or features of applications in namespace by adding deployment ID as suggested by Chang ([0062])

As per claim 71, the rejection of claim 70 is incorporated;

Giel discloses

at least one of the following acts:

identifying settings in a namespace associated with the first application; defining a name, a type, a description and default value for a setting; defining other metadata for the setting;

providing a validation rule for the setting; indicating service applicability for the setting; and, identifying a dependency using an assertion expression ([0085], "...analyzed using rules written by the expert..." show a validation rule)..

As per claim 72, the rejection of claim 71 is incorporated;

Giel discloses at least one of the following acts:

accessing a setting associated with the first application; and,

accessing a setting associated with a second application (claim 18, "…analyzing the configuration information…").

9. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (herein Keller, USPGN 2004/0049509) in view of Ahlstrom et al. (herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468), Grier et al. (herein Grier, USPGN 2002/0100017), Chang et al. (herein Chang, USPGN, 2005/0015761), and further in view of Eager et al. (herein Eager, US Patent. No. 5,960,200).

As per claim 58, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller/ Ahlstrom/Grier/Chang do not specifically disclose

wherein the configuration service component employs at least one of ACL-based security and role-based security are provided at per-setting granularity.

However, Eager discloses

wherein the configuration service component employs at least one of ACL-based security and role-based security are provided at per-setting granularity(c21:38, "...ACL...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Eager into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom/ Grier/Chang to include the above limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to controlling access to application resources of Windows applications as suggested by Eager ([0089]).

10. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keller et al. (herein Keller, USPGN 2004/0049509) in view of Ahlstrom et al. (herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468), Grier et al. (herein Grier, USPGN 2002/0100017), Chang et al. (herein Chang, USPGN, 2005/0015761), and further in view of Bondarenko et al. (herein Bondarenko, US PGPub. No. 2004/0083479).

As per claim 63, the rejection of claim 40 is incorporated;

Keller/ Ahlstrom/ Grier/Chang do not specifically disclose

at least one of URI and Xpath can access a setting within a namespace as well as in between namespaces.

However, Bondarenko et al. disclose

- at least one of URI and Xpath can access a setting within a namespace as well as in between namespaces[0069], for Xpath; and [0101], for URI).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Bondarenko into the teachings of Keller/ Ahlstrom/ Grier/Chang to include the above limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to enable third party integration of the application as suggested by Bondarenko ([0007], "...third-party integration...").

11. Claims 74 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hellerstein et al. (herein Hellerstein, US PGpub. No. 2002/0129356) in view of Keller et al. (herein Keller, US PGPub. No. 2004/0049509), Ahlstrom et al. (herein Ahlstrom, USPTN 6,418,468), Grier et al. (herein Grier, USPGN 2002/0100017) and further in view of Chang et al. (herein Chang, USPGN, 2005/0015761).

As per claim 74,

Hellerstein discloses

- a configuration service component that manages access to a configuration store, the configuration service component comprising an assertion engine component, wherein the configuration store stores persisted configuration information associated with settings for each of a plurality of instances of an application

according to a uniform semantics scheme, (Fig. 1, [0005], "In step 2, a configuration file or database…. This configuration file is typically updated…"; [0031], "…by querying then on demand or by maintaining a database with their configuration settings..." where database is according to a uniform semantics scheme.).

- , the assertion engine component facilitates administration of a validation rule by the configuration service component ([0048], "…A policy repository…entered periodically by the…administrator…" where policies are considered validation rules);

Hellertein does not specifically disclose

- and a legacy handler component facilitates synchronization with a legacy store including a registry.;
- setting for each of a plurality of an application, the persisted information for each of the plurality of instances isolated from persisted information for all of the remaining plurality of instances

However Keller discloses

- a legacy handler component facilitates synchronization with a legacy store including a registry.. ([0118], "…maintain references…the configuration files located…may contain this information. Examples…include…Microsoft Windows Registry….").
- setting for each of a plurality of an application, the persisted information for each of the plurality of instances isolated from persisted information for all

of the remaining plurality of instances([0129], "…distinguish he various application instances…", where it discloses distinguishable application instances and therefore, isolation of the plurality of application instances settings;).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Keller et al. into the teachings of Hellertein to include with a legacy store including a registry. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to share information among various heterogeneous systems as suggested by Keller ([0018]).

Hellertein /Keller do not specifically disclose

- The persisted information is standardized and the configuration store is standardized.

However, Ahlstrom

- The persisted information is standardized and the configuration store is standardized.(c8: 56-58, "…standard representation of configuration information is stored…");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ahlstrom into the teachings of Hellertein /Keller to include the limitation disclosed by Ahlstrom. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to deal with idiosyncratic systems with standardized representations as suggested by Ahlstrom (c6: 57-58).

Hellertein /Keller/ Ahlstrom does not specifically disclose

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application.

However, Grier discloses

- the persisted information being isolated according to a unique namespace for each instance; wherein each unique namespace for each instance of the application is derived from each of the following: a name of the application, a version of the instance of the application, a language of the instance of the application, a process architecture for the instance of the application and a public key token of the instance of the application ([0043], TABLE 1, for name, version, processor architecture, public key token and language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Grier into the teachings of Hellertein /Keller/ Ahlstrom to include the limitation disclosed by Grier. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to unambiguously identify information as suggested by Grier ([0041])

Hellertein /Keller/ Ahlstrom/Grier does not specifically disclose

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID.

However, Chang discloses

- each unique namespace is derived from a deployment ID([0114], "...the namespace...of... application...such as...deployment ID...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Chang into the teachings of Hellertein/ Keller/ Ahlstrom/Grier to include the limitation disclosed by Chang. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide differentiation of various versions in terms of certain elements or features of applications in namespace by adding deployment ID as suggested by Chang ([0062])

As per claim 75,

This is a means for claim reciting essentially the same limitation of claim 74 and is rejected for reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 74.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to argued independent claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Wang whose telephone number is 571-272-5934. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 - 4:00PM. Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip R. Wang/

Patent Examiner 10/8/2009